UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Government.

v.

Case No. 11-20693

ANNETTA POWELL, D-1,

Defendant.

SENTENCE HEARING

BEFORE CHIEF JUDGE GERALD E. ROSEN
United States District Judge
733 US Courthouse & Federal Building
231 W. Lafayette Street
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Tuesday, December 2, 2014

APPEARANCES:

CRAIG WEIER
Assistant United States Attorney
211 W. Fort Street
Detroit, MI 48226
On behalf of the Government.

JAMES C. THOMAS O'Reilly Rancillio, P.C. 12900 Hall Road Sterling Heights, MI 48313 On behalf of the Defendant.

To Obtain a Certified Transcript: Carol S. Sapala, RMR, FCRR 313.961.7552 www.transcriptorders.com

Case 2:11-cr-20693-AC-MKM ECF No. 47, PageID.191 Filed 02/05/15 Page 2 of 24 Sentence Hearing 12-2-2014 C O N T E N T S IDENTIFICATION PAGE WITNESSES None. 4 Sentence Hearing Certificate of Court Reporter 24 EXHIBITS MARKED RECEIVED IDENTIFICATION None Marked, Offered or Received Usa v Powell 11-20693

```
Sentence Hearing 12-2-2014
               Detroit, Michigan
 1
               Tuesday, December 2, 2014
 2
 3
               2:49 p.m.
 4
               THE CLERK: Now calling case number 11-20693,
 5
     defendant number one, United States versus Annetta
 6
     Powell.
 7
               THE COURT: Good afternoon. Appearances,
 8
    please.
 9
               MR. WEIER: If it please the Court, Craig
10
     Weier, on behalf of the United States.
11
          Also at counsel table is Brian Cuney from the
12
     Federal Bureau of Investigation.
13
               MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, my name is James
14
     Thomas. I'm appearing on behalf of Mrs. Powell who's
15
     here on my left.
16
          We can we approach?
               THE COURT: Please.
17
18
               (A discussion was held at the bench)
19
               THE COURT: All right.
20
          Mr. Thomas, please confirm that you've had the
21
     opportunity to review the Presentence Report with
22
     Ms. Powell.
23
               MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we have received the
24
     Presentence Report. I've reviewed it with her.
25
```

We have discussed it on several occasions and have noted it in our Sentencing Memorandum.

THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Weier, for the government?

MR. WEIER: Yes. I've reviewed the Presentence Report as well, Your Honor, and we've addressed it in the Sentencing Memorandum as well.

THE COURT: All right.

The recommended guideline range in the plea agreement was 33 to 41 months; that was based upon an offense level premised upon an amount of loss that was about \$2 million.

The Probation Officer, in the preparation of the report, calculated a slightly greater loss -- well, a loss slightly greater then the next level up. The next level up would have been the two, two and-a-half million dollars threshold.

Probation calculated the amount of loss at about \$2.6 million or about \$100,000 over.

I wanted to give both counsel, since both counsel objected to the amount of loss on the same basis, I wanted to give both counsel an opportunity to address that here on the record.

MR. WEIER: Thank you, Your Honor.

If I may, for the United States, I can indicate to the Court that I've discussed the matter with Mr.

Thomas. And that we are in agreement that to submit the case to the Court on the reduced sentencing guideline range. We're willing to stand behind that reduced range.

The reason being that we were unable to determine with any great specificity the loss figures steming from the transactions identified by the Probation Department in that extra \$500,000 or so losses that they assessed.

More specifically, the Probation Department assessed the full amount of the loan in calculating those losses, which I think, absent any other circumstances, might be inappropriate.

However, we were not able to specifically identify the collateral offset and the outstanding balance of those loans. So we're standing by the figures in the Rule 11 Plea Agreement.

MR. THOMAS: Judge, it was our position that the amount that we had agreed upon was what was readily proveable.

And that because of the vagaries of time and questions regarding reimbursement of loss amounts upon sale, that that should be the amount and nothing more.

And as a result, we're asking you for a 33 to 41 month guideline as was contemplated by the Rule 11 Plea Agreement.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to agree to the guideline range agreed to by the parties in the Rule 11 Plea Agreement.

The Court's gone through the Presentence Report looking at the relevant conduct referred to by the Probation Officer and the calculation and the amount of loss.

And although the Court is not able to say with any degree of certainty that the probation officer was wrong, the Court is not also -- is also not able to say with any degree of certainty that he was right. Some of the numbers are not amenable to precise calculation, unfortunately.

So the Court is willing to abide by that agreed upon amount of loss reached by parties. So the beginning guideline range will be 33 to 41 months.

I don't think there are any other issues with the Presentence Report, gentlemen?

MR. WEIER: No, Your Honor, on behalf of the United States.

MR. THOMAS: There are none.

THE COURT: Mr. Thomas, allocution on behalf of Ms. Powell.

MR. THOMAS: Judge, I should acknowledge first this is a case that has that has been extensively pre-tried.

We've have had several conversations with the Court relating to this matter and I know that you know what my feelings are about this particular type of prosecution; specifically as it relates to how we're going to do the sentencing as in this particular case with Ms. Powell.

I've submitted a Sentencing Memorandum and significant letters from people in the community who she's dealt with to talk about her as a person.

She's had a tough life. She lived in the City of Detroit. She was raised in a home where Mom and Dad both had handicaps. She learned American Sign Language. She was their voice for many years.

She is reported by people that she's worked with and her neighbors and friends to be a kind, caring, considerate person, a giving person; you know, the type of person you might have want to have as a friend or neighbor.

This is a case where it seems as if she started with the best of intentions and things got away.

She's acknowledged and embraced her responsibility for the document fraud and getting people into homes.

On one hand, it's the basis upon which there's many abandoned homes in Detroit. I don't know what to blame. I mean do we blame -- do we blame the economy in 2006 or 2007 for the fact that they're so many homes that people have walked way from?

Or is it the fact that the banks' lending policies were lax and that they weren't monitoring the loan documents as well?

Or was it Ms. Powell's part; and that is, being involved in trying to assist these people to get into homes that they may not have qualified for. I think it's a combination of all of those things.

I don't want to shirk her responsibility and I don't want it to seem as if she's not accepting her responsibility.

But, you know, she put in over a million-five of money that were proceeds of the sales of these properties back into the properties so she could make them habitable.

She took people and conducted classes on how it is they could manage the real estate as an investor; albeit they were supposed to be residential homes.

She found Section 8 tenants for the homes so that they could lease the homes. And when some of the people lost tenants, she would even help them to find new tenants, get them to come into the homes.

So the people that were investing in the homes, albeit improperly, would be able to make their payments and so that they could then build well, which was the big dream we all had in 2006 when the bottom fell out.

That is, people who were well intended to put money into their homes realized that they'd over-extended themselves and couldn't pay their mortgages, even without any fraud, were walking away from significant assets that could have appreciated, would have appreciated, had they had the time to continue to make payments, if they had the ability to continue to make their payments except for the fact the economy fell through.

Now that being said, she's embraced the fact that she's done something wrong. She has -- and the letters that you've seen acknowledged that to the people that have sent letters on her behalf.

I went to a seminar at Wayne State University the other day, you know, Ricardo Hinojosa was there, Jack Recoff was there; they're talking about how much time is too much time.

This morning I got up early and I read an opinion by a judge in the Southern District of New York, Judge Weinstein, who's talking about how it is that we've now got ourselves in the position where people are doing so much time.

There's certain sociological theories that say that it isn't amount of time that you give, it is the certainty of punishment.

And certainly as we have seen in this case proceed, we knew that the government was on a juggernaut and that there was no way we were going to avoid liability for what it was that happened here.

The certainty of punishment is here and we're not asking the Court for a probationary sentence. We think a term of incarceration with guidelines of 33 months may be too long under the circumstances for this particular defendant.

I'm going to ask to you vary to 18 months. I'm going to ask you to provide for restitution.

The Court asked a question about her business and how it is continuing. She has four locations, she has 20 employees, she will be able to pay restitution and she can start to pay that.

THE COURT: Who's going to run her business when she's away?

MR. THOMAS: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: Who's going to run her business?

3 MR. THOMAS: She has managers at each

location, you know. And at each location, she's had

5 extensive training with the managers in the last year

6 and-a-half.

1

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And we're certain that she's going to be able to continue the business and that she's going be able to comply with the law.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Weier?

MR. WEIER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I don't think there's been any issue about

Ms. Powell's ability to comply with the law. The issue in the case is Ms. Powell's willingness to comply with the law.

Mr. Thomas' allocution for Ms. Powell contained a great deal of argument which I called self congratulatory assertions in my sentencing memo for a reason.

Ms. Powell was doing no one any favors other than enriching herself. The assertion that Ms. Powell was trying to put people into houses they couldn't afford is not accurate.

Miss Powell was selling houses to people as investment properties. Ms. Powell was selling two or four or six or ten houses to people who couldn't qualify for one mortgage.

Ms. Powell was representing to banks that the properties were worth far more then they were. And, yes, if she put some money into the properties -- I certainly have not seen any evidence that she put 1.5 million in the properties. If she did, that money came from the lending institutions.

Ms. Powell didn't sacrifice anything. She used the money from the loans to improve the properties.

We've had --we've had some issues and we've had some issues with Ms. Powell's business as it currently is operated or was at least operated while Ms. Powell was on bond.

We demonstrated to the Court with an affidavit from the Special Agent of the IRS that Ms. Powell -- and I detailed this and I attached the affidavits in my sentencing memo.

This defendant is not a defendant who is incapable of complying with the law; she's certainly capable of complying with the law. But in 2012 while this case was pending, she committed another felony while on bond. We didn't prosecute her for that.

The IRS has chosen, they tell me, to pursue that matter administratively for reasons that are not entirely clear.

But this is not a person who has shown the Court by post-offense conduct that she will maintain a law abiding -- a law abiding future. And for that reason, I don't believe that Ms. Powell deserves leniency.

There's, as the Court is aware, a very big discussion in the criminal justice community now about lengths of sentences. I appreciate that. We have more prisoners in this country then any other country in the world, per capita. And it doesn't matter to the Court what my personal opinion about that is.

But I will say that there are still sentencing guidelines and those guidelines are advisory and those guidelines have a basis.

And the kinds of offenses that have created the numbers of prisoners that we're seeing in this country are not bank fraud offenses; I think the Court and Mr. Thomas are well aware of that.

This is a case where Ms. Powell broke the law not once or twice, but for six years. She emailed clients that they wouldn't -- if they had to tell the truth, you wouldn't get mortgages.

She emailed clients as late as 2010 when she was trying to resurrect her business.

That certain mortgage brokers would no longer deal with her because they would be liable for false statements in the applications because of the licensing laws.

This is somebody who not only broke the law, but did it consciously for a long period of time, was raided, the investigation continued, she was indicted.

As the case was pending, she continued to break the law. And to me, Your Honor, this is not a defendant who should be asking for leniency. That's all.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Powell, do you wish to address the Court?

MR. THOMAS: Judge as it relates -- may I have rebuttal just for a second?

THE COURT: I'm more interested --

MR. THOMAS: Should I have any further argument on the tax issue?

THE COURT: I'm really more interested in hearing from Ms. Powell.

THE DEFENDANT: I definitely accept full responsibility for what I did.

And during my time, you know, I learned personal development and, you know, just learning how to be a

better person.

THE COURT: Ms. Powell, may I ask you a couple questions that really arise out of the letters that I've read?

What lawyers say about their clients, what the prosecutors says about the defendant, I'm always interested in knowing, interested in hearing.

But I'm much more interested in what the defendant says about herself and what the people who know her say about her and, of course, the criminal conduct which I have to consider.

You have overcome much in your life. Mr. Thomas is certainly right about that. And you've had, until this extended criminal activity, which it is, you've had a very admirable life.

And everything in the letters that I read from your family, from your mother, who I found that -- your Mom's letter I found really a remarkable statement, talking about somebody who has overcome her disabilities. This is a beautiful letter, remarkably articulate and eloquent about you.

I was also struck by the letter from the contractor who you worked with, who apparently began on a -- you had an interesting relationship at first.

Apparently, you were tough with him, but you became friends, Mr. Wolf, but, apparently, you became friends. He talks about what a good heart you have and a good person.

But, on the other hand, the picture I get is a very strong-willed woman who's going to get her way no matter what, even if it makes -- even if it may be breaking the law and that's what I'm concerned about going forward.

I'm concerned about that when you believe that you're doing something for a greater good. You told me in your letter you believed that you were trying to help the City of Detroit and help people, put people into houses. You, obviously, were also trying to help yourself.

And I'm concerned that maybe you have blinders on when you're trying to help others and trying to help yourself and you're looking for shortcuts around the law. That's what it looks to me like happened here.

It was easy, there was temptation. You thought you were doing well by doing good. And you really weren't too concerned about the moral hazard that you were creating for yourself and for others, and weren't too concerned about the fact that you were, you know, cutting corners on the law. And I'm concerned that maybe that hasn't changed.

What could you tell me going forward?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, moving forward, you know, in real estate -- and, you know, it was just a matter of I didn't take the time to learn it. You have -- you know, the wrong people around you, you know, doing the same thing and you think it's okay. Far as me -- you said that you felt like, you know, I was, you know, trying to make money for me.

At the end of the day, when I closed on those houses, I could have took that money and ran. But, you know -- but I went back and I fixed those houses up.

So, you know, I understand what everything everybody is saying. Bottom line is when we closed, I had the money. I could have took the money and did other things with it. But I still took the time to go back and renovate those houses the correct way like I was supposed to.

You know with Section 8, in order for you to even put a tenant in there, it had to be newly renovated. So at the same time, I look at that.

As far as taxes, I got into taxes when -- you know, just -- based off, you know, franchise said here, you do the taxes. I failed because I never took the time to really, you know, learn. You got to read about --

THE COURT: What are you going to do when you finish your sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: When I finish my sentence?

THE COURT: What can you -- how do I know that you're not going to fall into the next scam?

THE DEFENDANT: There -- because one thing, I made a commitment to myself that I would not jeopardize my integrity for money, ego. It's just not worth it.

You're dealing with -- it's not worth it. You're dealing with people out there. It's just not worth it.

11 I know, you know, its -- it ain't worth it.

It's not worth your freedom, it's not worth, you, know, having to be, you know, away. It's just not worth it. It's not worth it.

But when I step out -- I mean -- I know you don't see it, but -- and I mean I have over 300,000 people that follow me on social media. It's all about inspiring people, letting people, you know, that committing crimes is not worth it. It's just not worth it. It's not worth it.

So I plan to step out and be a better, a better person then I was yesterday.

THE COURT: Well, I don't have a crystal ball; and I believe that you want to be.

But I hope that you're not going to be easily tempted into the next scam that comes along, because you're a wilful person and that's a good thing.

People who are wilful persevere and they are tenacious, but it's important that you maintain a perspective and make sure that you're not just plowing ahead and are yielding to the next temptation that comes along.

All right. As I've indicated, I'm going to accept the plea agreement and accept the guideline range of 33 to 41 months as a beginning point.

I do find some basis for variance here, given -some basis for variance here, given Ms. Powell's -- the
complete picture of Miss Powell's life.

She doesn't pose a threat to anyone. I don't think she poses a threat to the communities, certainly not any kind of threat of violence.

I am a little bit concerned about the blind spots she has; and she can benefit from some further training and education if she's going to remain in the real estate field or the tax field.

She is not a threat to herself or others. She doesn't do drugs. She's got good family support.

And unlike many defendants who come before the Court, she is a good candidate to pay the restitution

obligation that I'm going to order. And I hope that she will -- I hope that she will commit, as she says she will, to meeting the requirements of the restitution obligation. So I am going to do a slight variance.

In the matter of the United States of America versus Annetta Powell, criminal docket number 11-20693, with respect to Count One of the indictment, which is the count of conviction here, it is the judgment of this Court, after considering the sentencing guidelines and the factors contained in the sentencing statute, as well as those factors which the Court has discussed here on the record with the defendant and counsel, that the defendant be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 24 months.

It is further ordered that the defendant pay a special assessment of \$100 for each count of conviction, which will be due immediately.

Restitution, as I've discussed here, is imposed by the Court in the amount of \$2,093,366.70, which I believe is the agreed upon amount of restitution.

MR. THOMAS: It's in the Rule 11.

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I was just thinking I think that might be a typo. If the Court will give me one minute?

THE COURT: I thought that was the amount that was in the plea agreement.

PROBATION OFFICER: Russ has initially 921,601.

MR. WEIER: That was long ago.

THE COURT: That wasn't correct.

MR. THOMAS: That was the typo.

THE COURT: That was not correct.

I am going to waive, however, the imposition of a fine or costs of incarceration, costs of supervision, due to the defendant's relative lack of financial resources compared to the restitution obligation that the Court has now ordered.

Court believes that rather than imposing these fines and costs, it would be better for the defendant to devote her resources to paying the restitution amount.

While the defendant is in custody, she will participate in the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program. The Court is aware of the requirements of the program and approves the payment schedules and orders the defendant's compliance.

I've reviewed the defendant's health and substance abuse history. There is none, so I am going to suspend the mandatory drug testing, based upon my determination that the defendant poses little or no risk of future

substance abuse.

While on supervision, the defendant will abide by the standard conditions of supervised release which have been adopted by this Court as well as the following special conditions.

Due to the restitution obligation, the defendant will not incur any new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without the approval her probation officer unless she's in compliance with the payment schedule.

She will provide her probation officer with access to any requested financial information. She will make monthly installments payments on any remaining balance of her restitution and special assessment at a rate and schedule recommended by her probation officer and approved by the Court.

Due to the defendant's back tax obligation, she will make arrangements with the Internal Revenue Service regarding a monthly payment plan regarding the payment of back taxes, plus any taxes and interest that may accrue.

The defendant is to provide a payment arrangement schedule with IRS to her probation officer. All right.

MR. THOMAS: Judge, just for the record,

she's taking steps towards doing that already. She will follow through.

THE DEFENDANT: I paid like a majority of it.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Powell, I have now accepted your plea agreement, sentenced you in accordance with it.

And under the terms of your plea agreement, you agreed that if I were to accept it and sentence you in accordance with it, you would waive or give up any right that you had to appeal either your conviction or your sentence. So because I have now done this, you have no right to appeal either your conviction or your sentence. Okay?

MR. WEIER: Your Honor, what period of supervised release?

THE COURT: I thought I said two years, didn't

I? I may have skipped over that. Two years supervised

release. Thank you.

MR. WEIER: Thank you.

THE COURT: I've received a report from

Pretrial that the defendant's in full compliance with

her pretrial bond.

And, Mr. Weier, I assume you've no objection allowing her to remain on bond --

```
Sentence Hearing 12-2-2014
               MR. WEIER: That's correct.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: -- until she's designated.
 3
               MR. WEIER: That's correct.
 4
          We've also discussed -- parties have discussed a
 5
    report date extension already.
 6
          Mr. Thomas is going to ask the Court to extend her
 7
    report date until the end of February. I don't object
 8
     to that.
 9
               THE COURT: That's fine.
10
              MR. THOMAS: Thank you, judge.
11
               THE COURT: In the meantime, Ms. Powell --
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you so much.
13
     appreciate it.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Very good.
15
     Thank you.
16
               (This hearing concluded at 3:22 p.m.)
17
                    CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
18
19
20
       I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
21
       from reported proceedings in the above-entitled
22
      matter.
23
24
     s/Carol S. Sapala, FCRR, RMR February 5, 2015
25
                    Usa v Powell 11-20693
```